IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA

GRAYLIN GRAY,)
Plaintiff,	4:13CV3156
V •))
NEBRASKA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONAL SERVICES, ROBERT P. HOUSTON, Director of NDCS, FRANK X. HOPKINS, Deputy Director of Institutions, BRAIN GAGE, Warden of TSCI, RULE, CM, Case Manager of TSCI, BARKER, CW, Case Worker of TSCI, JASON TAYLOR, CM, Case Manager of TSCI, JOHN LEDUC, CM, Case Manager of TSCI, RADAR, Ofc., Correctional Officer of TSCI, KRAUSS, Ofc., Correctional Officer of TSCI, and SCHULTS, CM, Case Manager of TSCI,)))
Defendants.))

This matter is before the Court on its own motion. On September 6, 2013, the Court required plaintiff to show cause why he is entitled to proceed in forma pauperis ("IFP") pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. \$1915(q) (Filing No. 6). The Court determined that the following six cases were brought by plaintiff and dismissed as frivolous: Gray v. Condon, No. 4:95CV3177 (D. Neb. June 21, 1995); Gray v. Grammar, No. 4:95CV3446 (D. Neb. Apr. 18, 1996); Gray v. Smith, No. 4:95CV3405 (D. Neb. Mar. 15,

1996); Gray v. Grammer, No. 4:95CV3404 (D. Neb. Feb. 14, 1996);
Gray v. Smith, No. 4:95CV3339 (D. Neb. Nov. 30, 1995); Gray v.
Webber, No. 4:95CV3326 (D. Neb. Jan. 4, 1995). Plaintiff did not
file a response to the Court's September 6, 2013, Memorandum and
Order, nor has he paid the Court's \$400.00 filing and
administrative fees. Accordingly, this matter will be dismissed
without prejudice. A separate order and judgment will be entered
in accordance with this Memorandum Opinion.

DATED this 5th day of November, 2013.

BY THE COURT:

/s/ Lyle E. Strom

LYLE E. STROM, Senior Judge United States District Court

^{*} This opinion may contain hyperlinks to other documents or Web sites. The U.S. District Court for the District of Nebraska does not endorse, recommend, approve, or guarantee any third parties or the services or products they provide on their Web sites. Likewise, the Court has no agreements with any of these third parties or their Web sites. The Court accepts no responsibility for the availability or functionality of any hyperlink. Thus, the fact that a hyperlink ceases to work or directs the user to some other site does not affect the opinion of the Court.